



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,181	12/15/2003	Anju Tandon	20655.0200	4379
66170	7590	05/18/2010	EXAMINER	
Snell & Wilmer L.L.P. (AMEX)				GOYEA, OLUSEGUN
ONE ARIZONA CENTER				
400 E. VAN BUREN STREET				
PHOENIX, AZ 85004-2202				
				3687
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
05/18/2010		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

HSOBELMAN@SWLAW.COM
DMIER@SWLAW.COM
JESLICK@SWLAW.COM

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/736,181	TANDON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	OLUSEGUN GOYEA	3687	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 14 April 2010.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11,12 and 26-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 4,5,10 and 13-25 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-3,6-9,11,12 and 26-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 15 December 2003 and 18 July 2008 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All
 - b) Some *
 - c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION***Prosecution History Summary***

This final office action is in response to Applicant's submission filed on 04/14/2010. Currently, claims 1-3, 6-9, 11-12, and 26-29. Claims 1, 3, 6-9, 11 and 12 have been amended. Claims 4-5, 10 and 13-25 have been canceled. Claims 26-29 are newly added.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1, 26, 28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Claim 1 recites the limitations: "analyzing, by the computer based system, the un-reconciled amount", "determining, by the computer based system, a classification of the un-reconciled amount", "transmitting, by the computer based system, a notification in response to the classification of the un-reconciled amount" and "processing the un-reconciled amount based on the classification".

In addition, claim 26 recites the limitation: "...wherein the classification is at least one of write-off, further review required and reconciled."

Upon closer review of Applicants' disclosure, there is no support in the specification describing a classification determination process. The specification discloses that the global reconciliation tool help ensure financial control in business areas by capturing the financial transactions at a common place, and reconciling and scrutinizing the transactions being captured. It enables rapid identification and reporting of any imbalance (or un-reconciled data) that may expose the business to undue financial losses. It also enables stronger balance sheet updating and reporting (paragraph 0018).

Applicant's disclosure teaches that the financial data received (either on a scheduled basis, or upon each transaction, or by manual implementation) from the remote terminals 110 is reconciled with stored master financial data (step 306). Any un-reconciled amounts are identified (step 308) and are reported in a desired output format (step 310). Un-reconciled transactions may then be researched and/or written off and corporate balance sheets and other accounting reports may be automatically updated (step 312). The process 300 may be repeated in various sessions on a recurring basis with a variety of remote terminals 100 during the continuing operation of a business entity (paragraph 0044).

From the above paragraphs, there are no support(s) for the newly added limitations, described above, for claims 1 and 26. Further, claims 28 and 29 recites

similar limitations. Applicant is recommended to particularly point out the portion(s) of the disclosure that shows support for the newly added limitations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 7 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US 20050114239 (Fiascone et al. – hereinafter referred to as Fiascone) in view of US 20040059597 (Tkayczyk et al. – hereinafter referred to as Tkayczyk), US 5189608 (Lyons et al. – hereinafter referred to as Lyons), “Admitted Prior Art” (APA – Applicant’s specification) and US 20010051917 (Bissonett et al. – hereinafter referred to as Bissonette).

Referring to **claim 1**, Fiascone discloses a method and system comprising:

matching, by the compute based system, the remote financial data to master financial data based on a set of predetermined rules; [see, paragraph 0023 (lines 9-11)]

wherein the master financial data is stored in a first format and at least one of the remote terminals stores remote financial data in a second format; (see, paragraph 0020, 0021 and 0023)

identifying, by the computer based system, an un-reconciled amount based on the matching; (see, paragraph 0024)

analyzing, by the computer based system, the un-reconciled amount; [see paragraph 0025, 0026 (lines 1-8)]

transmitting, by the computer based system, a notification in response to the classification of the un-reconciled amount; [see paragraph 0025 - *The unmatched/un-reconciled amounts are identified and presented to a user.*]

processing, by the computer based system, the un-reconciled amount based on the classification; [see paragraph 0025, 0026 - *The user is able*

to trace the details of the un-matched transaction and make necessary adjustments to clear the discrepancies.]

But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose a system for reconciling financial transaction comprising:

transmitting, by a computer based system for managing financial data, a standardized template for capturing remote financial data to a plurality of remote terminals, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems;

receiving, by the computer based system, the remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template;

wherein the standardized template is configured to convert the remote financial data from the second format to the first format.

determining, by the computer based system, a classification of the un-reconciled amount; and

updating, by the computer based system, the master financial data based on the remote financial data.

However, Tkayczyk teaches a similar system with the limitations:

transmitting, by a computer based system for managing financial data, a standardized template for capturing remote financial data to a plurality of remote terminals, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems; (see paragraph 0015 (lines 17-18), 0018 (lines 10-15), 0035, 0037]

receiving, by the computer based system, the remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template; [see paragraph 0020, 0022, 0035, 0036]

In addition, Lyons teaches a system with the limitation: wherein the standardized template is configured to convert the remote financial data from the second format to the first format. [see col. 37, lines 35-38; col. 38, lines 33-37]

Further, APA teaches the limitation: determining, by the computer based system, a classification of the un-reconciled amount; [see Applicant's specification, paragraph 0002 – *It is well known in the art that unmatched/un-reconciled transaction are marked as either write-off or the like in the reconciliation processes.*]

Also, Bissonette teaches a system with the limitation: updating, by the computer based system, the master financial data based on the remote financial data. [see paragraph 0013, 0021, 0027]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have modified the method and system according to Fiascone to have incorporated the limitations: transmitting, by a computer based system for managing financial data, a standardized template for capturing remote financial data to a plurality of remote terminals, the standardized template operable on a plurality of operating systems; receiving, by the computer based system, the remote financial data from the plurality of remote terminals via the standardized template; wherein the standardized template is configured to convert the remote financial data from the second format to the first format; determining, by the computer based system, a classification of the un-reconciled amount; and updating, by the computer based system, the master financial data based on the remote financial data, in accordance with the teachings of Tkaczyk, Lyons, APA and Bissonette, in order to capture and reconcile financial data as well as update balance sheets and the like based on the reconciliation process, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risks of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 7**, Fiascone discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein the remote financial data includes a transaction involving an account, and wherein the master financial data includes a balance due for the account.

However, the system according to Fiascone teaches that exchange account data (from various brokerage and exchanges) are reconciled against a firm's account data. It would be obvious to one skilled in the art that the exchange account data and firm account data is analogous to remote financial data and master financial data respectively. In addition, the functions and capabilities of the system are applicable in various financial establishments. [see paragraph 0009 (lines 4-8)].

Referring to **claim 12**, Fiascone discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above, further comprising: maintaining, by the computer based system, identification data of users authorized to enter the remote financial data. [see paragraph 0026 (lines 5-13)]

Claims 2, 3, 6, 8, 11, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, in view of Tkayczyk, Lyons, APA, Bissonett, and further in view of US 5392390 (Crozier).

Referring to **claim 2**, the combination of Fiascone, Tkayczyk, Lyons, APA and Bissonette discloses the method and system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein at least two of the remote terminals use different operating systems.

However, Crozier teaches a system with the limitation: wherein at least two of the remote terminals use different operating systems. (see, col. 3, lines 27-30)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have modified the method and system according to the combination of Fiascone, Tkayczyk, Lyons, APA and Bissonette so as to have included the limitation: wherein at least two of the remote terminals use different operating systems, in accordance with the teaching of Crozier, in order to provide an application and operating independent system for reconciling financial data, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 3**, the combination of Fiascone, Tkayczyk, Lyons, APA and Bissonette discloses the method and system as applied in the rejection of claim 2 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein at least two of the remote terminals use different accounting software applications.

However, Crozier teaches a system with the limitation: wherein at least two of the remote terminals use different accounting software applications. (see, col. 3, lines 27-30)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have modified the method and system according to the combination of Fiascone, Tkayczyk, Lyons, APA and Bissonette so as to have included the limitation: wherein at least two of the remote terminals use different accounting software applications, in accordance with the teaching of Crozier, in order to provide an

application and operating independent system for reconciling financial data, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 6**, Fiascone discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 3 above, comprising: updating a balance sheet based on the un-reconciled amount. (see paragraph 0029)

Referring to **claim 8**, Fiascone discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 6 above. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein the standardized template comprises: a format that is independent of an operating system and an application.

However, Tkaczyk teaches a system with the limitation: an said standardized template comprising: an operating system and application independent format. [see paragraph 0018, 0025 (lines 17-19), 0035, 0037].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have modified the system of Fiascone so as to have included the limitation: an operating system and application independent format, in accordance with the teaching of Tkaczyk, in order to have extended the system's compatibility with various operating platforms, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by

any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 11**, Fiascone discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 8 above. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose the limitation: further comprising: transmitting, by the computer based system, to the remote terminals, a plurality of functions for generating customized templates for capturing the remote financial data.

However, Tkaczyk teaches a system with the limitation: further comprising: transmitting, by the computer based system, to the remote terminals, a plurality of functions for generating customized templates for capturing the remote financial data. [see paragraph 0020 (lines 15-22), 0024 (lines 1-7) and 0026 – *The supervisor workstation can be used for the creation of standardized templates. In addition, the workstation allows the supervisor to reconfigure the standardized template.*]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have modified the system of Fiascone so as to have included the limitation: further comprising: transmitting, by the computer based system, to the remote terminals, a plurality of functions for generating customized templates for capturing the remote financial data, in accordance with the teaching of Tkaczyk, in order to provide system flexibility to create customized templates for entering data, since so doing could

be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 26**, the combination of Fiascone and Tkayczyk discloses the method and system as applied in the rejection of claim 8 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein the classification is at least one of write-off, further review required and reconciled.

However, APA teaches the limitation: wherein the classification is at least one of write-off, further review required and reconciled. [see Applicant's specification, paragraph 0002 – *It is well known in the art that unmatched/un-reconciled transaction are marked as either write-off or the like in the reconciliation processes.*]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have modified the method and system according to the combination of Fiascone and Tkayczyk so as to have included the limitation: wherein the classification is at least one of write-off, further review required and reconciled, in accordance with the teaching of APA, in order to classify the results of the reconciliation process, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Referring to **claim 27**, Fiascone discloses the system as applied in the rejection of claim 26 above. But Fiascone does not explicitly disclose the limitation: wherein the format of the standardized template is provided in JAVA format.

However, Tkaczyk teaches a system with the limitation: wherein the format of the standardized template is provided in JAVA format. [see paragraph 0035, 0037].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have modified the system of Fiascone so as to have included the limitation: wherein the format of the standardized template is provided in JAVA format, in accordance with the teaching of Tkaczyk, in order to provide the standardized templates in JAVA format, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fiascone, in view of Tkayczyk, Lyons, APA, Bissonett, and further in view of US 7130822 (Their et al. – hereinafter referred to as Their).

Referring to **claim 9**, the combination of Fiascone, Tkayczyk, Lyons, APA and Bissonette discloses the method and system as applied in the rejection of claim 1 above. But the combination does not explicitly disclose the limitation: the receiving

further comprising: scheduling, by the computer based system, a time for the receiving with the remote terminals.

However, Their teaches a similar system with the limitation: scheduling, by the computer based system, a time for the receiving with the remote terminals. (see col. 4, lines 6-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, to have modified the method and system according to the combination of Fiascone, Tkayczk, Lyons, APA and Bissonette, so as to have included the limitation: scheduling, by the computer based system, a time for the receiving with the remote terminals, in accordance with the teaching of Their, in order to receiving financial data through a standardized template at a scheduled time, since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Referring to **claims 28 and 29**, they contain similar limitations as set forth in claim 1 and therefore are rejected based on the same rationale. Claims 28 and 29 discloses a system and a tangible non-transitory computer-readable storage medium with instruction stored thereon to perform the method described in claim 1.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments in regards to the rejection of claims 1, 6-8, 11-13, 16-17, 20-21 and 23-25 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) based on US 20050114239 (Fiascone) in view

of US 20040559597(Tkaczyk) and US 5189608 (Lyons), claims 2-3 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) based on Fiascone, Tkaczyk, Lyons and US 5392390 (Crozier) and claims 9, 14, 15, 18 and 22 under 35 U.S.C 103(a) based on Fiascone, Tkayczyk, Lyons and Their have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants submits that they do not concede that Fiascone is indeed prior art with respect to this application, and Applicants reserve the option to antedate Fiascone. Nonetheless, Applicants assert that Fiascone is limited to a system which collects data from various sources, and then compiles the data together at the central collection point in a common data format. Once the data is in a common format, the data can be compared based on a user selected parameter. However, Fiascone does not provide remote data sources with an operating system and/or application independent data template. Moreover, the system of Fiascone does not analyze, or classify un-reconciled data.

In addition, Applicants submit that Tkaczyk disclose a system to create a plurality of standardized templates for inputting CS (clinical study) data, but not for converting or transforming the data from one format to another. Tkaczyk requires that the data be initially inputted in a format that is consistent with a master data format, so that when records are compiled with the master data, the data is able to be integrated into the master data without conversion or processing.

Further, Applicants submit that Lyons discloses a system for standardizing the financial information accounting systems of an organization. However, the system does

not provide for capturing data at a remote terminal or for identifying and analyzing un-reconciled data.

Applicants assert that the cited references alone or in combination do not disclose or contemplate at least, "analyzing, by the computer based system, the un-reconciled amount", determining, by the computer based system, a classification of the un-reconciled amount", or "transmitting, by the computer based system, a notification in response to the classification of the un-reconciled amount" (emphasis added) as similarly recited in independent claims 1, 28, and 29. Furthermore, claims 2-3, 6-9, 11-12 and 26-27 variously depend from independent claim 1.

When a phrase similar to "at least one of A, B, or C" or "at least one of A, B, and C" is used in the claims, Applicants intend the phrase to mean any of the following: (1) at least one of A; (2) at least one of B; (3) at least one of C; (4) at least one of A and at least one of B; (5) at least one of B and at least one of C; (6) at least one of A and at least one of C; or (7) at least one of A, at least one of B, and at least one of C.

In response to Applicants' arguments, Examiner respectfully disagrees.

As an initial matter, the present application was filed 12/16/2003 with an effective date of 12/15/2003. US Application 10/707,155 (Fiascone et al.) was filed November 24, 2003. Thus, Fiascone et al. qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C 102(a)/103(a).

Applicants argue that neither of the references taken alone or in combination do not disclose or contemplate at least, "analyzing, by the computer based system, the un-

reconciled amount", "determining, by the computer based system, a classification of the un-reconciled amount", or "transmitting, by the computer based system, a notification in response to the classification of the un-reconciled amount" as similarly recited in independent claims 1, 28, and 29.

Examiner notes that these argument is directed towards newly added amendments and have been addressed in the updated rejection.

The system according to Fiascone teaches that exchanges and brokerage houses can be connected to format module and/or may transmit data directly to matching module when the data is known to be in a proper format. (paragraph 0019 and 0020; figure 1)

In addition, the system according to Tkaczyk teaches the collection of data via standardized template from remote location (user computer) and storage into a centralized database.

The system according to Lyons teaches using a template to convert data values received in a second format into a first format. [see col. 37, lines 35-38; col. 38, lines 33-37]

Thus, the combination of Fiascone, Tkaczyk, Lyons and the other cited references at least suggests the limitations of Applicant's invention.

Further, "The test for obviousness is not whether the features of a secondary reference may be bodily incorporated into the structure of the primary reference....Rather, the test is what the combined teachings of those references would

have suggested to those of ordinary skill in the art." *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 425, 208 USPQ 871, 881 (CCPA 1981). See also *In re Sneed*, 710 F.2d 1544, 1550, 218 USPQ 385, 389 (Fed. Cir. 1983) [MPEP 2145(III)]

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to OLUSEGUN GOYEA whose telephone number is (571)270-5402. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday, 8:00am to 5:00pm (ET).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Gart can be reached on (571)272-3955. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/O. G./
Examiner, Art Unit 3687
05/10/2010

/Matthew S Gart/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3687